DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 363 SO 011 110

AUTHOR Shaver, James P.; And Others
TITLE An Interpretive Report on the Status of Pre-College Social Studies Education Based on Three NSF-Funded Studies.
INSTITUTION National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Case Studies; Classroom Research; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; Educational Improvement; Educational Practice; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Materials; Research Needs; *Social Science Research; *Social Studies; *State of the Art Reviews; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Use Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the findings of three studies to define the status and needs of social studies education. The three studies used various techniques to compile data. A national survey of teachers and administrators was conducted to find out the course offerings, time spent in teaching various subjects, materials and textbooks used, and impact of federally-sponsored in-service education on science, math, and social studies education. A review of the research literature from 1955-1975 provided a summary of the effectiveness of institutional practices, perception of needs, and teacher training requirements. The third study used a case study approach and compiled research data using ethnographic strategies to describe classroom practices. Findings showed that only ten to twenty percent of social studies teachers use New Social Studies materials, and the textbook is the dominant tool of instruction. Teachers believe that inquiry teaching is too demanding of students and an unproductive use of instructional time. The state of research in social studies education is in disarray with little practical relevance to the everyday concerns of the classroom. Ethnography is a promising methodology for rich data about teaching. The authors suggest that since teachers were found to be the key in student learning, they should be more involved in curriculum development and in research. (Author/MR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164363

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James P. Shaver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

AN INTERPRETIVE REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PRE-COLLEGE SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION BASED ON THREE NSF-FUNDED STUDIES

James P. Shaver
O.L. Davis, Jr.
Suzanne W. Helburn

The National Council for the Social Studies
2030 M Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

SO 011 110

The material in this report is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Purchase Order Number 78-SP-1132. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Abstract

A task force of the National Council for the Social Studies reviewed three NSF-funded studies of status in science, mathematics, and social studies education and prepared an interpretive report on status and needs in social studies education. The three NSF-funded studies were varied in methodology: a national survey of administrators and teachers using sophisticated instrument development and probability sampling methods; three reviews of the research literature from 1955 through 1975; and an ethnographic field study at eleven sites (each site being a high school and its feeder schools) from around the ration. Task force conclusions included the following.

Only ten to twenty percent of social studies teachers are using New Social Studies materials. The textbook is still the dominant tool of instruction and the focus of testing. The curriculum is largely history and government, with some geography at the elementary school level. Inquiry and reasoning, including valuing, receive little attention and motivation is largely external. At the elementary grade level, social studies instruction is losing ground to the "basics" of reading and math.

Teachers believe that inquiry teaching is too demanding of students and an unproductive use of instructional time. Transmission of knowledge is important to teachers, with content to be used to socialize students as good citizens. Socialization to do well in succeeding years of school is also viewed as important. Parents and teachers share these views, so teachers rarely teach about issues controversial in the community. Teachers are concerned about students' general lack of interest in social studies.

Teachers' views on these matters are frequently discordant with those of supervisors, professors, curriculum developers. This helps to explain the reluctance to adopt New Social Studies project materials. The demands of public universal education are a part of the realities of teaching that social studies educators need to address.

Research findings in social studies are in disarray. Ethnography is a promising methodology for rich data about teaching.

Currently, social studies presents an impression of contrast and contradiction: Stability and change; diversity, yet national sameness. The needs seen will depend on one's frame of reference.

Background

The central interest of the National Council for the Social Studies is the education of children and youth--what happens to students as a result of their school-related experiences, especially in social studies programs. Questions--both quantitative and qualitative--about the nature of those experiences across the nation are frequently asked by and of NCSS members. The answers must often be either a pointed, "I don't know", or conjectures based on limited personal experience. All too rarely are data available that permit well-substantiated statements. In 1976, the National Science Foundation funded three projects, each based on different methodological approaches, to investigate status in science, mathematics, and social science/social studies education. Taken together, the reports from the studies provide a substantial remedy for the lack of information about social studies.

Although most educators probably date National Science Foundation involvement in education from the efforts following the launching of Sputnik I in 1957, NSF has been concerned with pre-college science education from its inception in 1950. Much of the NSF-funded curriculum development work and many of the teacher institutes have been in chemistry, biology, physics, and mathematics; however, the social sciences have also been given attention. And, at the elementary and secondary level, NSF has tended to define social science education as the K-12 social studies curriculum.[1]

NSF involvement in curriculum development has not been without controversy, especially in the last few years. Some critics have raised questions about the impact on elementary and secondary education relative to the amounts of money spent. Some have worried about the potential of a nationally imposed curriculum. Others have questioned the appropriateness of the content of the NSF curricula, based as it has been on the academicians' views of their disciplines. And some have argued that NSF materials, such as those developed by the Man--A Course of Study (MACOS) Project, were out of step with and subversive to the legitimate values of many families. These disputes over NSF curricular efforts have created considerable political, especially Congressional, pressure on the Foundation to redirect or restrict its curriculum development and teacher education efforts. In light of the various conflicts and pressures, the NSF Education Directorate decided, in 1976, to take soundings on the status of science education to provide a more substantial factual basis for charting its future directions.

As had been the case in prior NSF curriculum development and teacher education efforts, the studies of the status of science education initiated by NSF in 1976 included social studies education. NSF varied the orientation and methodology of the studies intentionally to provide differing perspectives on the nature and needs of science, mathematics, and social studies education.

---

[1] In the rest of this report, we use the term "social studies", rather than "social science education" or "social science/social studies education".

One of the funded studies was a national survey of administrators and teachers (referred to henceforth as the National Survey)[2] to obtain responses to questions about such matters as the courses offered, the textbooks and materials used, the time spent in teaching different subjects, and the impact of federally-supported inservice education on science, mathematics, and social studies education. The study used sophisticated survey instrument development and probability sampling techniques, and produced an abundance of data that present a quantitative perspective based on self-reports of what is happening in social studies.

The second set of studies reviewed the research literature produced from 1955-1975 for its information. Three separate reviews of the research literature were conducted--in science, mathematics, and social science/social studies education[3]. (The social studies research review is henceforth referred to as the Review.) Each review was to summarize what the literature had to say about such matters as status and trends in instruction, the effectiveness of instructional practices, the perceptions of needs in the curricular area, and teacher credentialling and training. Limits on time and personnel precluded reviewing all of the relevant original research reports, so considerable reliance was placed on previously reported reviews of research.

The National Survey and the reviews of research fit rather traditional

---

[2]Iris R. Weiss. Report of the 1977 national survey of science, mathematics, and social studies education. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C7619848. Center for Educational Research and Evaluation, Research Triangle Institute, March 1978. Available from: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), Washington, D.C. 20402, #038-000-00364-0, $6.50; National Technical Information Service (NTIS), U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA 22151, #PB280192/AS, $15.00; Education Research Information Clearing House (ERIC), 4833 Rugby Avenue--Suite 303 Bethesda, MD 20014, #ED 152565, $1.16 microfiche, $32.81 paper.

[3]Stanley L. Helgeson, Patricia E. Blosser, and Robert W. Howe. The status of pre-college science, mathematics, and social science education: 1955-1975. Volume I. Science education. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C762067. Center for Science and Mathematics Education, The Ohio State University, 1977. Available from: GPO (see footnote 1), #038-000-00326-3, $4.25.

Marilyn N. Suydam, Alan Osborne. The status of pre-college science, mathematics, and social science education: 1955-1975. Volume II: Mathematics education. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C7620627. Center for Science and Mathematics Education, The Ohio State University, 1977. Available from: GPO, #038-000-00371-2, $4.50.

Karen B. Wiley. The status of pre-college science, mathematics, and social science education: 1955-1975. Volume III: Social science education. Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1977. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C7620667. Available from: GPO, #038-000-00363-1, $6.25.

modes of educational inquiry. The third study did not, although its methodology has been receiving increased attention among educational researchers in recent years. The study[4] (referred to henceforth as CSSE) involved field observations at eleven sites--each including a high school and its feeder schools--in order to portray teaching and learning conditions in science education through the ethnographic, anthropological style of participant observation. The sites were selected to provide a diverse but balanced (rural/urban, geographic, ethnic, socio-economic) representation of American schools, and to ensure that an experienced field researcher was available to be on-site for a substantial period of time. In addition, a national survey, with questions based on the field observations, was conducted to confirm the ethnographic case findings.

Although the NSF Education Directorate's primary goal in sponsoring these three studies with their diverse methodologies was to obtain status data that would be helpful in developing its own policy and program decisions, it was clear that the reports contained substantive findings and much about methodology of potential interest to educators. The three status studies under review undoubtedly constitute the most ambitious and extensive studies ever conducted of the status of science, mathematics, and social studies in American schools. For that reason alone, they are notable. Because of the different methodologies each employed, they raise different questions and cast different light on a number of conclusions of potential interest to readers. Moreover, CSSE represents the first major, large scale application of ethnographic procedures in educational research in this country. Some of the eleven case studies are better done than others; yet each is interesting and revealing taken alone. And the synthesis chapters in the report are exciting reading as they build meaning by drawing from and interweaving the individual case studies. To alert the education community to the existence of the studies and their

---

[4]Robert E. Stake and Jack A. Easley, Jr. Case studies in science education. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C7621134. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation and Committee on Culture and Cognition, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, January 1978. Case studies: Terry Denny, Some still do: RIVER ACRES, Texas; Mary Lee Smith, Teaching and science education in FALL RIVER; Louis M. Smith, Science education in the ALTE schools; Alan Peshkin, Schooling-at BRT: A rural case study; Wayne W. Welch; Science education in URBANVILLE: A case study; Rob Walker, Case studies in science education: PINE CITY; Rodolfo G. Serrano, The status of science, mathematics, and social science in WESTERN CITY, USA; James R. Sanders and Daniel L. Stufflebeam, School without schools: COLUMBUS, Ohio's educational response to the energy crisis of 1977; Jacquetta Hill-Burnett, Science in the schools of an eastern middle seaboard city; Gordon Hoke, VORTEX as harbinger; Rob Walker, Case studies in science education: GREATER BOSTON. Available from: GPO, Volume I: The case reports, #038-000-00377-1, $7.25, Volume II: Design, overview and general findings, #038-000-00376-3, $6.50; NTIS, total set, #PB282840, $76.75. Also available from NTIS, the 16-booklet set from which the two GPO volumes were assembled. Prices available on request.

possibilities for comprehending schooling in this country, NSF invited the National Council for the Social Studies and seven other professional educational organizations to prepare brief interpretive papers. Each paper was to be targeted at the organization's members and other educators with related interests.

The Nature of This Paper

Our intents in preparing this paper were: (a) to convey as reliably and accurately as possible a picture of status and needs in social studies education as revealed by the three studies; and (b) to encourage other social studies educators to go to the reports to study themselves the rich data base and to ponder over the implications for educational practice and research.

In preparing such an interpretive paper, and with a mandate to be brief, it did not seem feasible or appropriate to summarize in detail and footnote the many findings cited in the over 2,000 pages of the reports from the three studies. On occasion, we have provided general references to guide readers to passages which stimulated our impressions.

This paper is not intended as a critique of the studies. Our purpose was to interpret, not to criticize. We did have some hesitancy about relying too heavily on the self-reports obtained in the National Survey as indications of what is happening rather than what people would like to think or have others think is going on. We wondered about the biases that may have been injected into the review of research in social studies education by the reliance on prior reviews of research, rather than on original reports. And the case studies involved personal, experiential data-gathering techniques whose validity for producing replicable and generalizable views of educational practice is not yet clearly established. Despite these reservations, we found that generally the three reports confirmed one another. Interestingly, in our discussions of the major ideas to be presented in this paper, we found ourselves relying heavily on the case studies material for our first line of impressions--suggesting the richness we found in ethnographic-type findings. But the sources of the impressions about the status of social studies which we elaborate on the following pages can be found in all three reports.

An important reservation about this paper must be stated openly and clearly. Any attempt to sketch a general description of social studies education from three comprehensive project reports, such as we reviewed, must be viewed with caution. We were continually impressed with the enormity of the task and with the great difficulty of doing justice to the immense amount of data and to the complex variety of teachers, students, and classroom circumstances they represent. In an introductory paragraph to the CSSE Executive Summary (Ch. 19), the authors lament the need to prepare that condensation:

> Having already partially mutilated the delicate and complicated portrayals of happenings and feelings as drawn together by our field observers by attempting to sort and aggregate them in our findings chapters, we now further over-simplify by presenting them

in grand summary. We urge the reader who is appreciative of the problems and efforts of pre-college education to read the complete case studies.

We were similarly concerned in producing this further rendering of all three studies.

It has been difficult to do justice to the magnitude and richness of the data. Exceptions to our general statements will not be hard to find in specific schools. And other persons, analyzing the reports from different perspectives, will come up with different emphases and--not frequently, we trust--divergent, even conflicting, interpretations. To acknowledge the constraints on our review and interpretations of the studies, we have consciously chosen to write this paper in the first person, rather than using the more detached third-person pronouns common in such documents. We urge readers to turn to the reports themselves to confirm, disconfirm, and/or add dimension to the impressions given on the following pages, and to use the wealth of meaning there to build their own understandings of social studies education.

We have divided the paper into five sections. The first three sections are primarily discussions of status, although needs are implied. (The nature of those needs will often depend, of course, on the frame of reference of the reader.) Section I gives our impressions of the social studies curriculum and classroom practices in our nation. Section II discusses teachers' views of the school and of social studies. Section III contrasts teachers' views and concerns with those of academicians, curriculum developers, and district supervisors. These divisions were made for the purpose of organizing our comments, and the sections are highly interrelated. Section IV discusses the state of research in social studies education. And in Section V, Conclusions, we comment on our overall portrayal of social studies education.

I. Curriculum and Classroom Practice

Obviously, the focus of schooling is students; its intent is to influence their learning. An inquiry into the status of social studies education, it seemed to us, must center on the primary question, What is happening to the students? Other questions are peripheral and gain interest only as they relate to that central question. The three NSF-funded studies reveal a great deal about the types of experiences youngsters are likely to be having in social studies classes.[5] The impressions that follow were sometimes confirmations of our prior understandings of social studies. Often, however, they were contradictions or new insights.

---

[5]The NSF-funded reports do not deal with the status of student learning from these experiences as, for example, the National Assessment of Education Progress is intended to do. Chapter 15 of the CSSE report discusses pedagogical issues related to learning, and Section 3 of the Review speaks to the outcomes of social studies instruction.

The Central Role of Teachers. The reports remind us that "The teacher is the key to what social studies will be for any student" (CSSE, Ch. 19). The teacher's beliefs about schooling, his or her knowledge of the subject area and of available materials and techniques, how he or she decides to put these together for the classroom--out of that process of reflection and personal inclination comes the day-by-day classroom experiences of students. This is not to say that social studies classes are not affected by factors such as the characteristics of the students enrolled, but only to emphasize that the teacher plays the primary structuring role.

The three NSF-funded studies confirmed the view that individual teachers have a great deal of freedom, often more than they recognize or wish to admit, in deciding what social studies will be. Teachers do lack control of the budget and so are restricted in introducing new programs (the CSSE and National Survey studies both found that teachers felt their choices of materials to be seriously restricted by the budget). Nevertheless, their part in the textbook adoption process and their position as the arbiters of what goes on in their classrooms allow teachers to effectively veto curricular changes of which they do not approve. When we try to describe what happens to students in social studies classes, then, the ever-present reality is the teacher, interacting with students and deciding, day-by-day and moment-by-moment, what will happen in class.

Federally-funded Projects. Despite the fair amount of federal funding for curriculum development since the late 1950s, one experience that the social studies student is not likely to have is interaction with curriculum materials produced by federally-funded projects, especially those funded by NSF.[6] Only a small proportion of social studies teachers seems to be aware of what has been termed the New Social Studies, and the proportion of users is, as one might expect, even smaller. The self-reports of the National Survey (Ch. 4) and the results of the Review (Sec. 4.0) indicate that from ten to twenty-five percent of teachers were using at least one of the federally-funded New Social Studies materials.[7] The percentages are less for NSF-funded materials. None of the eleven CSSE school districts were using HSGP, SRSS, or the NSF-funded anthropology materials. However, the National Survey and CSSE provide no information about the influence of New Social Studies ideas on conventionally produced textbooks, or on teacher training. The Review notes a lack of systematic research on these possible indirect influences of the New Social Studies movement.

---

[6]The percentage of social studies teachers who report (National Survey, Ch. 4) attending NSF-sponsored institutes, workshops, and conferences is low--4% for K-3, 8% for 4-6, 4% for 7-9, and 5% for 10-12 grade teachers. By contrast, the corresponding percentages for science teachers are 2, 23, 32, and 47.

[7]The higher percentages come from studies cited in the Review. Because of limited samples and the small rates of return from respondents for most of those studies, we regard the results as probably inflated. Even the self-reports of the National Survey may be inflated by the tendency of survey repondents to give socially desirable answers.

The Textbook as Central. Concern with the content and orientations of textbooks is not trivial, for the textbook is the dominant tool of instruction--the basis for recitation discussions and for student testing. Although the Review indicated that there may have been more variety in teaching methods during recent years than many thought, the CSSE field observers found little to verify that claim. Furthermore, the National Survey (Ch. 5) found that the most commonly used texts are the "traditional" ones and that around fifty percent of the teachers reported using a single textbook. Slightly over fifty percent (sixty percent in grades ten through twelve) of the teachers reported that they would continue using the same textbook or program if given free choice. Also, roughly twenty to thirty-five percent of the teachers reported using texts which were over five years old. But they also did report (Ch. 7) that out-of-date teaching materials were a major problem.

Subject Matter Focus. The social studies curriculum still seems to be mostly about history, government, and, particularly at the elementary level, geography, with slight attention to current social problems. Students tend not to encounter interdisciplinary teaching; teachers do not typically draw material from the various social sciences, much less from the natural sciences. And, current, controversial issues--particularly those viewed as off-limits by the local community, but national ones as well--are rarely dealt with. As noted above, the emphasis tends to be on topics presented in the textbook. Finally, there is little evidence of "fragmentation"--if that term is used to refer to the proliferation of new courses and topics to study, the use of mini-courses, and multiple readings from paperbacks--at the expense of traditional coverage. At the twelfth grade level, the American problems course has frequently been replaced with "social science" offerings, such as psychology, sociology, economics.

Objectives and Teaching Strategies. Knowing for the student is largely a matter of having information; and the demonstration of the knowledge frequently involves being able to reproduce the language of the text in class discussions or on tests. Experience-based curricula, despite recent professional writing about learning through participation, appear to be rare. Lecture and discussion are the most frequently reported teaching techniques (National Survey, Ch. 6; also see the Review, Sec. 1.3), with activities such as field trips and simulations used much less often. "Inquiry teaching"--with its variety of meanings--was also not commonly seen by CSSE observers nor reported by National Survey respondents. Large group, teacher controlled question/answer recitations are customary. (From fifty to sixty percent of the respondents indicated they needed help if they were to implement inquiry teaching, and only ten percent of the total indicated that adequate help was available.)

The textbooks that students read and the recitation that follows in most social studies classes still is content, i.e., information, oriented. There is little attention to the development of systematic modes of inquiry and reasoning, including valuing. CSSE observers saw some efforts to get students to think for themselves and develop their own reasoning powers; but more often students were asked to respect understandings that came from others, supposedly

validated, but by processes that were not explicated, much less brought into the classroom discourse to be applied by students.

Affective learning objectives were rarely an explicit part of the curriculum in the CSSE schools. Implicity, the thrust of textbook use and teacher-initiated interactions was to teach students to accept authority and learn the "basic" facts and conclusions about our history and government. The CSSE authors concluded (Ch. 15) that "book learning" is the objective--children and youth are to be disciplined to learn expeditiously from printed materials.

Motivation and Student Interest. As a corollary to the mode of teaching discussed above, motivation is largely external. One learns for grades, for approval, because it is the thing one does at school, or to get into college. That students will learn through intrinsic motivation--because information or skills are useful for coping with problems of personal importance, or to satisfy curiosity--is not a common assumption among teachers. This is particularly noteworthy since the Review and CSSE both disclose that students still report social studies to be uninteresting.

Despite being treated as nonself-starting learners, students are likely to find one common denominator among their social studies teachers, as with mathematics and science teachers: That is a concern for young people. Teachers like their students, and are interested in their well-being, personally and academically. However, secondary school teachers are more likely than elementary ones to be concerned with covering subject matter rather than helping each student do his or her best. Still, they tend to create a comfortable environment for their students, and students often like their teachers, even while lacking interest in the subject matter.

Status of Social Studies and Science. It seems clear that, particularly in the primary grades, both social studies and science are losing instructional time in elementary schools because of the increasing emphasis on the "basics", defined as reading and arithmetic. Social studies fares somewhat better than science because language arts and reading material often incorporates social studies topics. Furthermore, elementary teachers, who typically include the inculcation of social skills and attitudes as part of social studies, do involve students in experiences relevant to that goal. Surprisingly to us, the CSSE teachers agreed with the back-to-basics movement. Even in the high schools, where subject matter specialization is important to teachers, reading is seen as a prerequisite to the adequate learning of content, and so deserving of greater attention as a "basic".

An interesting contrast between social studies and science is prevalent at the secondary school level. Social studies courses are regularly required each year as part of general education, but only general biology (in the tenth grade) seems to get this treatment in science. Chemistry, physics, and advanced biology courses are electives, and clearly part of career training--preparation for college or for science-related careers. On the whole, social studies courses are not organized sequentially to train students in social

science or for social science-related careers. Consequently, while science courses emphasize laboratory methods--although often of the follow-the-cookbook variety--there is little attention in social studies to social science research methodologies. And, one social studies course is rarely "more advanced" than another; most tend to be geared to a level at which nonacademically inclined students can obtain a passing grade and fulfill graduation requirements. This, too, may have implications for the lack of student interest.

Females and Minorities. Those wondering what is happening to ethnic minority students and females in social studies, science, or mathematics classes will not find much information in any of the three NSF-funded reports we reviewed. The usual sex differences in achievement scores and enrollment in science and mathematics classes are mentioned. CSSE does report some indications of increased enrollment by females in science classes in the case study schools, but not that girls like those subjects any better. There are expressions of concern about motivation among lower socio-economic and nonEnglish-speaking minorities. But little is revealed about how these students fare in classrooms. In fact, in reading the CSSE report, we often sensed a tendency to avoid mention of the ethnic identity of students. The National Survey and the Review say even less about the classroom experiences of ethnic minority students and females.

Recapitulation. Some students may be experiencing social studies classes in which they use products from the various New Social Studies projects, actively participate in teacher-guided in-class and out-of-class learning experiences as a basis for formulating and learning knowledge, and take part in "inquiry" discussions and exercises where they learn standards and means for validating knowledge. More likely, however, the students' social studies classes will be strikingly similar to those that many of us experienced as youngsters: Textbook assignments followed by recitation led by a teacher who, in his or her own way, likes students and tries to show concern for them--and avoids controversial issues, but tries to pitch the class at the students' level.

A sense of stability emerges from the three status studies--a lack of change in social studies instruction over the years that was unexpected by us. This stability may be interpreted by many social studies educators as an overwhelming defeat for the reform efforts of the 1960's and early 1970's and the irrational persistence of outmoded, dysfunctional patterns of materials and teaching. Such a conclusion probably does not take adequate account of the complex realities of social studies in the schools. There have been dramatic changes in some school programs, and exciting teaching is going on in many places. But fundamental, far-reaching changes do not occur easily in as vast and governmentally decentralized an enterprise as American public education. Also, our perspectives may be too limited at this point in time to judge the long-run impact of that reform movement. Moreover, some of the stability in the social studies curriculum may reflect desirable responses to legitimate societal needs for the socialization of the young. Certainly, such considerations make it clear that teachers' views of school and social studies are

critical to an appraisal of the status and needs of social studies education.

II. Teachers' Views of Social Studies and Schooling

Our impressions of teachers' views of social studies and of schooling have been touched on in our discussion of curriculum and classroom practice. For example, it should come as no surprise at this point that the CSSE field observers (e.g., Ch. 12) found teachers to be primarily concerned that their students learn the content, the subject-matter of the field being studied. In essence, although general statements of educational goals include items such as the development of inquiry skills, the teachers' major concern is with the students' learning of an accepted body of knowledge. For that purpose, teachers tend to rely on, and believe in, the textbook as the source of knowledge. Textbooks are not seen as support materials, but as the instrument of instruction by most social studies teachers.

Textbooks and Inquiry. The teachers' view of the textbook as authoritative undoubtedly stands in the way of their involving students in inquiry. But that is not the only factor. The hands-on, experience-centered learning of many inquiry-oriented curricula is seen as too demanding of students; too much is often expected of students at their level of intellectual development and, probably even more important, self-discipline. From such a stance, inquiry teaching is nonproductive. Time is wasted when students are allowed to formulate problems and pursue their own answers; and the few hours for instruction are too precious to be squandered in that way. There is so much content to be learned.

Another factor in social studies teachers' views of the importance of transmitting knowledge as contrasted with teaching students to inquire and reason, is that they are not likely to be model inquirers themselves. (Remember that a large proportion of the teachers in the National Survey reported assistance with inquiry teaching as a need.) This should be no surprise, given the teachers' own schooling. Undergraduate history and social science college courses, as well as pre-college courses, rarely involve students in active consideration of penetrating questions about the validity of knowledge. Nor is laboratory or field research commonly a part of such courses. As elementary, secondary, or college students, prospective teachers do not experience systematic scientific or other--e.g., ethical--inquiry, nor teachers who model the encouragement of such questions from students. The teachers' own education conditions them to perceive the appropriate role of the student as productive--i.e., doing assignments and learning content--subordinate, rather than independent speculative thinker and investigator. This view of social science and history academic role models as a conservative force working in opposition to the social studies reform movement of the 1960's is in contrast with a tendency in the social studies literature to characterize social scientists as promoting the use of historical/scientific inquiry methods by students. This dominant influence on teachers' perspectives must be considered by those interested in changing the current mode of social studies instructions.

Controversial Issues. It would be a mistake to think that parents are upset by social studies teachers' transmission-of-knowledge view of education. For the most part, parents are comfortable with teaching aimed at passing on knowledge accumulated by others, rather than at encouraging students to raise creative challenges or think critically. In fact, despite the long history of concern by the National Council for the Social Studies for academic freedom and the teaching of controversial issues, and the conclusion in the Review (Intro., Sec. 1.2) that "social studies educators" agree that dealing with controversial issues in the classroom is a particularly significant problem for social studies teachers, few of the CSSE teachers reported problems in that area. Generally, they were quite sensitive to the values of the community in which they taught (it appeared that, in fact, such sensitivity was a common criterion, explicit or not, in the hiring of teachers), and had little trouble presenting their subject matter without affronting local feelings. Communities expected that teachers would venture some distance into uncomfortable topics; but the "tactfulness" on the part of most teachers in handling some issues and avoiding others precluded confrontation, making even the occasionally "radical" teacher tolerable.

This avoidance or diplomatic handling of controversial issues by social studies teachers should not be viewed as cowardice or moral irresponsibility on their part. In fact, it fits with the view that the subject matter of the textbook is the regular business of the classroom, from which one should not be distracted.

Another possible explanation for the tendency to avoid controversial issues, it occurred to us, is the influence of a continuing emphasis in social studies on history, government, and geography. Economics and sociology tend to be more policy/issue oriented disciplines; anthropology often strikes directly at ethnocentrism. Or, it could be that the failure of these social sciences to impact the curriculum is due to the same view that leads teachers to avoid controversial issues per se.

Perhaps most important of all, the lack of concern with controversial issues squared with another central element in the teachers' views of their role. One of the most consistent CSSE findings was the concern on the part of teachers with what was termed the "socialization" of their students.

Socialization. Efforts at socialization have two different but related aspects. One is primarily school-oriented; the other is citizenship-oriented. The first has largely to do with the preparation of students for "something to come". For example, seventh graders have to be prepared for the eighth grade, especially for the eighth grade teachers' expectations. (Failure to do so reflects on both students and teachers.) Students also have to be ready for the skill and content demands of future courses. One reason for the central place of instructional materials, especially the textbook, is the belief that preparing students for later success requires teaching them to learn from such material. Generally, the concern is with helping students learn to accommodate to the schooling system, which it is assumed demands order and discipline for effective learning.

Accompanying beliefs are that extrinsic motivation is essential if students are to pay attention to their school work. Teachers believe that the personal make-up of students and the home situations from which they come militate against a more idealistic reliance on intrinsic motivation. Students must learn to pay attention to directions, to questions, to classroom presentations as a basis for future learning; learning to carry out assignments is crucial for future success.

Much of this socialization has a work ethic, success-oriented, "middle-class" flavor. It is important for students to learn self-discipline, to learn to persistently try their best, to keep trying no matter how hard the task. Although more "liberal" socializers might put more emphasis on encouraging individual expression, even skepticism, teachers see it as more appropriate to train students to be hard working, busy, polite, competitive, independent workers--and so on.

Teachers consider testing to be an important way of learning if students have learned the content, because, if they have, that is evidence that socialization efforts have been successful. The obvious corollary is that the instructional materials are used for socialization and that socialization is preemptive: Correcting behavior such as day dreaming or cheating takes precedence over conceptual learning.

The second aspect of socialization has to do with citizenship. Science teachers, as well as social studies teachers, advocate and try to inculcate "American values"--although all will not agree on what the values are. A major goal is to impart the attitudes that will make the students adjusted, participating citizens. Included are respect for the law and for the rights of others, and appreciation of the American political system. Contrary to the claims of some,[8] the CSSE investigators concluded that it would be "incorrect to sort teachers into two groups, one of which teaches good courses in science and one of which indoctrinates youngsters in the social customs and values of the community" (Ch. 16). All teachers, except the completely disillusioned or intimidated, indoctrinate--although in different degrees, with different tactics, and stressing different values.

The teachers' perception of their role in socialization fits, of course, the sociological and anthropological view that formal schooling functions in part to transmit and preserve the society's values. Recognition of the extent to which teachers view socialization as important--both for school success and citizenship--may help to explain why many curricular innovations have not been adopted. Critical thinking, inquiry, experience-based curricula may simply not be compatible with the socialization aims of the teachers called upon to use them.

---

[8]For example, Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis. Defining the social studies. Bulletin 51. Washington, D.C.: The National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

Student Motivation. Along with teachers' acceptance of the textbook as source of knowledge, and their view of teacher as authoritative giver of assignments and preparer of students for later success, runs another strong finding about teachers: A major problem to them is the lack of student motivation. In the National Survey (Ch. 10), a little over fifty percent of the teachers reported lack of student interest in the subject matter to be a problem. Teachers at the various CSSE sites frequently mentioned motivation of students as a major problem. To some extent, this meant discipline--e.g., students interrupting class by visiting, arriving late, leaving without permission. But the concern is broader than student misbehavior. In contrast to lack of student interest, only twenty-eight percent of the social studies teachers indicated in the National Survey that difficulty in maintaining discipline was a problem. Lack of motivation in some schools even manifests itself in refusal by students to attend school.

Teachers are concerned that the "carrot and the stick" motivation of grades doesn't work anymore--if it ever did--except with bright, academically able students. High interest in the subject matter of courses for its own sake makes a student seem unusual and may even result in alienation from peers. Particularly distressing to many teachers, in light of their textbook-socialization orientation, is what appears to be a recent increase in the unwillingness of students to accept authority, to accept textbook "truths", to do their assignments or even to believe that they are worth doing. The sense of frustration is summed up on one CSSE teacher's statement (Ch. 15) that

> It's almost as though we have to prove why we're here, why we're functioning. (They as much as say:) "What makes you think you have anything of value to teach us?" You know, I get the feeling many times that I'm on the defensive as a teacher. It isn't enough that I stand up and say, "This is your assignment." I almost feel as though I have to prove it, to prove that there's value in doing it, other than the fact that I just want them to do it.

Teachers who have tried to motivate students by trying to make their courses more "relevant" have often not found the results to be any better. Anticipating what a variety of youngsters will find of interest on any one day is no simple task; on the other hand, the students' view of what learnings might be useful to them in the future are often very limited.

Although the lack of interest and motivation seems to perplex teachers, we picked up no feeling that it moved teachers to examine the basic assumptions from which they teach. Teachers do not seem to see a relationship between their textbook/subject matter focus, passive student learning, and their uses of the curriculum for socialization and the motivation problem. Nor did we find any indication that teachers are concerned about the level of cognitive development that students might need to deal meaningfully with the abstract material of textbooks. This apparent lack of awareness and reflectiveness has implications for teacher preparation programs that bear attention by the profession.

The "Basics". Teachers, as well as administrators and parents, seem to be clear about one thing: The importance of the "basics"--arithmetic and, especially for social studies teachers, reading--as major determinents of learning. From reading some professional journals, one might get the impression that concern with basics such as reading is being forced on social studies teachers who are "really" concerned with more "fundamental basics", such as critical thinking for citizenship. Some teachers do consider skills that they teach, other than reading, to be "basic". But, as we have noted above, an overwhelming impression is that most social studies teachers see textbook content, not higher reasoning processes, as important. Obviously, teaching based on written materials must rely heavily on student reading. The cry, "back to the basics", especially in regard to reading, is most frequently not viewed by social studies teachers as a threat, but as congruent with their recognition that reading is essential to other learning. Furthermore, reading tends to be seen as a prerequisite, not a skill that might be learned through involvement in other learning. Again, the allocation of time to the basics of reading and writing cuts into that for social studies at the elementary level. But the importance of the emphasis is supported by junior high and senior high teachers.

III. Divergent Views of Academicians, Curriculum Developers, and Teachers

What appears to be a different perspective on the "back to basics" movement is but one symptom of the generally discordant relationship between classroom teachers and university subject matter specialists. The interests and orientations of the two groups are different in ways that came through strikingly, particularly in the CSSE report. In fact, their views of what is important in social studies education are often so dissimilar that it is as if teachers and university social studies educators were dealing with two different worlds of schooling.

We have noted above the concerns of teachers with socialization, and with having students learn knowledge as it is presented in the textbook. Teachers also are anxious about classroom management, and use content to that end--for example, assigning extra homework to punish rule breakers or giving good grades for being quiet and working hard. As part of the ongoing system of schooling, their own teachers imbued those values and norms in them as students. And now they have returned to participate in and contribute to the functioning of a system they learned to take for granted. They desire the approval of other teachers, just as other teachers seek their approval. They do not want to look ineffective in the eyes of their principal, for that could have consequences more serious than social disapprobation--such as transfer to another, less desirable school in a big district. Students and parents are part of the school's social system, too, and teachers seek their respect and approval--just as all of us desire the approval of the important others in our lives. Most of these significant others for teachers share the same concerns for socialization, for orderly schools, for student knowledge as reflected in tests over textbook content (even the parents who found similar social studies classes to be boring when they were students), and for knowing the "basics" before going on to more advanced things such as conducting investigations and conceptualizing on one's own as a student.

The common complaint of teachers about "ivory tower" professors takes on particular meaning in light of these concerns of teachers. It is not just, or perhaps so much, that education professors don't know much about how to teach a particular subject matter area (as teachers often say); it appears to be more that the professors' concerns are with other aspects of teaching. Disputes about pedagogical styles, different ways of organizing curricula, distinctions between social science and social studies education, appropriate philosophies of history, and critiques of textbooks pale in the face of the personal concerns of teachers who must manage groups of students to fulfill system goals so as to survive (literally, in some schools) and gain the respect of students, other teachers, administrators, and parents. Teachers do not see an epistemological link between course content and maintaining classroom control that university professors do not comprehend or appreciate. It is simply that teachers need, or believe they need, to use content in certain ways to achieve their goals and university professors frequently fail to appreciate those goals or the techniques. From the teachers' point of view, professors are often unprepared to provide appropriate preservice training, inservice assistance, or new curricula.

In short, the teacher's beliefs and the demands of the school as social system are largely incompatible with the norms of the university scholarship system and with the norms of teaching espoused by trainers of teachers. Teachers and professors of history and social science both value content. But the university professor usually sees the discipline's conclusions as the ends of learning and eschews the use of content for management and socialization purposes. The teachers and the professors assume, therefore, different outcomes from the study of the academic subject. At the same time, teachers' treatment of subject matter as a means to the major goal of socialization is viewed by social studies specialists as inappropriate and dysfunctional, a necessary evil at best. Of course, it is not that the social studies specialists or the history and social science professors are against socialization; they are just interested in socializing in different directions.

If this portrayal is correct, it makes understandable teachers' reluctance about, even hostility toward, efforts of university professors, even history and social science professors,[9] to assist them; and it helps explain why that "intelligentsia"--except through the textbooks they write--has little reforming effect on what happens in social studies classrooms, and why other teachers and parents do have an influence. Teachers may not often express their concerns clearly (and the specialists tend to reject them when they do), but they are clear about the sources to which they can turn for help. Although the National Survey (Ch. 4) indicated that teachers do report that college courses are an important source of information about new curriculum materials, other

---

[9]We have discussed earlier the usually implicit and unplanned dominance of historians and social scientists as role models for social studies teachers. Here we are referring to explicit attempts to intervene and influence school practices.

teachers are the most frequently reported source. Inservice training, including summer institutes, is seen as most helpful, according to CSSE, when the emphasis is not on revamping the teacher's conceptualizations but on talking with other teachers and sharing "bags of tricks" for classroom use.

Supervisory Personnel. The feeling of uselessness, even animosity, toward university professors is also often extended toward district supervisory personnel. For example, in the National Survey, about thirty percent of the teachers said they needed no help with learning new teaching methods or obtaining information about instructional materials, and slightly over forty percent indicated they did not receive adequate supervisory assistance in these areas. Part of the difficulty, according to CSSE, is that school support systems--inservice training and the resource personnel at the district level--are weak. Staffs are inadequate in number, with supervisors given many different responsibilities on top of having two hundred or more teachers to work with. Much of the supervisor-teacher contact is through bulletins sent from the central office--about planning to be done by committees, about schedules, and about obligatory inservice sessions with outside consultants. Intentionally or not, indeed, central office personnel and teachers often seem to isolate themselves from each other.

The staffs are weak in the teacher' eyes in other ways. A basic reason that teachers tend to pay little heed to supervisors and their inservice programs is that they don't view these persons as informed about the realities of the classroom. Supervisors and consultants tend not to deal with the teacher's real and difficult teaching problems--such as keeping lessons going in the face of the inattention and disruptions of unmotivated children, adapting curricular materials to achieve socialization goals for which they had not been designed. It is not that teachers don't want help; rather it is that they want "good" help, assistance that is responsive to their teaching situation as they see it, for they believe that they are best equipped to know what their needs are. And the more graduate work the central office person has done, the more likely it is that his or her views of schooling will not be in accord with the teacher's view of the realities of the classroom. From the teacher's point of view, advanced graduate work can hardly be expected to make the supervisor more helpful when it involves learning beliefs and attitudes about pedagogy and content that are dissonant with the teachers' own views, and when, as the CSSE report notes, there is no theory of instruction available that deals with the diversity of uses to which teachers put subject matter in the actual classroom situation.

The Fate of Curriculum Projects. Appreciation for the viewpoint of teachers also can, as noted above, help explain the fate of the New Social Studies materials. A major purpose of federal funding for curriculum development was to provide districts and teachers with alternative offerings from which to choose. Although some debate the extent to which an adequate breadth of alternatives has been provided, certainly the goal has been met to a fair degree. But great numbers of districts and teachers have chosen not to use the new materials. "Sour grapes" does not seem a plausible explanation; there is no reason to believe that any great number of social studies teachers rejected the new curricula because they had not been involved in the curriculum develop-

ment projects or training institutes. Unadopting teachers are generally not obstructionsists. Instead, it is simply more appropriate to them to continue doing what they have done before--practices consistant with their own values and beliefs and those they perceive, probably accurately, to be those of their communities. The new materials just don't "fit".

Teachers judged the new materials as likely to work only in exceptional situations, with elite groups of students who had attained the basics and perhaps more important, proper self-discipline. They saw, or sensed, when they were aware of the new materials, the contradictions between the developers' purposes and their own--the emphasis in the new materials on content, on reasoning and inquiry, and, consequently, the different use of subject matter. Not only was the achievement of goals they thought important threatened by the materials, but their central classroom expectations (e.g., everyone quiet and working on the same assignment) and management techniques were challenged. Some of the support by teachers for the "back to the basics" movement may even be interpreted as reaction to the demands of the curriculum reform attempts of the 1960's--the new topics and content organizations and unusual teaching roles not only seemed difficult to carry out but flew in the face of the teacher's view of the needs of students and the school.

Realities. If this portrayal of dissonance between teachers, on the one hand, and professors, supervisors and curriculum developers, on the other, suggests to the reader that our sympathies lie with the teachers, you are correct. Undoubtedly, some teachers are incompetent or unwilling to exert the effort necessary for good teaching. But reading the CSSE report has recalled our own days in pre-college classrooms and reminded us of the difference between what is and what could be. Too often what we read, and hear, and propound ourselves in the educational literature and at professional meetings represents an ideal which may not, and perhaps should not, be attainable. The legitimacy of socialization goals, although understood by anthropologists and sociologists, has not been examined adequately by those concerned with formal conceptualizations of social studies education and used to set a realistic context for teacher education and curriculum development.

Moreover, it is not just the obligations of universal public education that have been given short shrift by curriculum developers and teacher educators, but the constraints as well. To change one's perspective from that of reformer of schooling and student learning to that of teacher confronted with managing/directing the instruction of several groups of secondary school students each day (or one group of elementary school youngsters for several hours)--all to be done in the context of particular school building, district, and community beliefs and values--raises serious questions about the limited intentions of teacher educators and curriculum developers. Theories and reform ideas meet hard realities. For example, consider the potential consternation of a teacher urged to use an inquiry approach to teach five or six large classes daily, each containing many students who do not want to be where they are and for whom that class is only one of their classroom experiences during the day and over the years. The demands of system maintenance--of the classroom, the school, the district, the society--it seems to us, have not been adequately addressed in schema for curriculum development and teacher education. Failure to address such primary concerns has been a consistent failure from the

Progressive Education Movement in the early Twentieth Century to the competency-based teacher education movement of today. Reform, to be effective, must be based on the recognition that teachers operate within a total system, which must be mobilized and revamped if individual teachers are to make striking modifications in their students' social studies experiences.

This discussion brings us back to the purpose of this paper: To share impressions of the three NSF-funded status studies of science education in large part to encourage others to mine the wealth of material there. It should be evident that we believe the reports to be "must" reading for social studies teacher educators, supervisors, curriculum developers, and researchers. But what about social studies teachers? Is there anything of interest and importance for them?

In terms of practical, helpful suggestions for teachers to deal with those very real, personal teaching problems to which we have referred, the reports have little to offer. But for all of the teachers who wonder in moments of quietness what it is all about, and whether their commitments and frustrations

---

To give readers an idea of the national distribution of the CSSE Sites and to help them identify case studies that might be of particular interest to them, brief descriptions of the sites from the CSSE report are listed below:

Chapter in Vol. I of CSSE Report	Code Name	Description
1	RIVER ACRES	a suburb of Houston
2	FALL RIVER	a small city in Colorado
3	ALTE	a suburb of a large Midwestern city
4	BRT	a consolidated district in rural Illinois
5	URBANVILLE	a metropolitan community of the Pacific Northwest
6	PINE CITY	a rural community in Alabama
7	WESTERN CITY	a small city in middle California
8	COLUMBUS	the Columbus, Ohio, school district
9	ARCHIPOLIS	an Eastern middle seaboard city
10	VORTEX	a small city in Pennsylvania
11	GREATER BOSTON	an urban section in metropolitan Boston

---

are shared by teachers beyond their own immediate school building, the CSSE case studies can be valuable reading. They offer the opportunity to share in the thinking, beliefs, practices of teachers from around the country, in teaching situations similar to and different from one's own, to judge the extent to which one's own perspectives are shared, to develop an increasingly conscious sense of oneself as a teacher in a bureaucratic, universal education system, to examine--and perhaps, to reaffirm--one's role in that system.

We do not propose that teachers read CSSE because it will revolutionize their teaching or make them more open to the perspectives of teacher educators and curriculum developers at variance with their own. To the contrary, we suggest that the case studies will often help social studies teachers see that their concerns are shared by other teachers and to sense the legitimacy of their classroom perspectives. Our point is not that the status quo should be reinforced, but that proposals for change can best be evaluated and implemented when those who must play a central role understand and value their own positions. Teachers have too long been on the defensive against the "intelligentsia". If teachers and professors and curriculum developers can become more conscious of teachers' beliefs and values, and of the origin and functionality of those beliefs and values as an integral part of the socialization function of mass education, then the groundwork may be laid for more realistic, effective definition and solution of instructional problems.

Teacher education and curriculum development need not undermine the teacher's management position, or appear to teachers to do so. Many of the goals of the New Social Studies can be taught in ways that take into account the realities of the classroom. But some of those goals may have to be modified in light of the purposes and realities of public education; and social studies teachers may decide that their beliefs and values also need modification to confront their own concerns about student motivation and to satisfy educational goals they deem important. The consistent student reports that social studies is uninteresting and the teachers' own concern about motivating students to learn suggest, for example, the need to re-examine the assumptions underlying textbook-recitation teaching. At the same time, it would be naive at this point to advocate that the textbook be abandoned as a central instructional tool, or to argue that to do so would solve the problems of student motivation. Why the textbook has remained the central tool and how to utilize that form to achieve a wider range of educational goals are questions that have not been adequately addressed by social studies educators. Answers to both must take into account the social content of classroom teaching.

IV. Research

Elementary and secondary school teachers are not much aware of educational research. Nor are they much influenced by research findings, largely because the findings usually have little practical importance for the classroom. Instructional research in social studies education is aimed at such matters as the effects of different teaching methods, the characteristics of teachers, and the content of textbooks. How to handle the difficult problems of classroom management that teachers find pressing and how to accomplish the socialization goals which teachers believe are important have not been matters of inter-

est to researchers. By contrast, behavior modification research seems to have impacted classrooms, especially those taught by special education teachers, because of its ready application to classroom management problems.

Even if social studies teachers were generally concerned with questions about how to teach students to be creative, independent thinkers, or how to sequence learning activities to achieve higher order cognitive and affective outcomes, the research literature would probably provide them little assistance in their efforts. The Review confirmed in great detail what commentators on research in social studies education have noted before: The research knowledge in the field is basically in disarray. There are few cumulative findings of either practical or theoretical significance. Most of the research (as in science education) is done by doctoral candidates and is not done from a theoretical base nor using a strategy designed or likely to build knowledge based on related, replicative studies. The conclusions in the Review are replete with indications of areas of interest to social studies educators (not necessarily elementary and secondary school teachers) in which there is a lack of studies, inclusive findings, or unexplained conflicting results. Syntheses of past research have not been particularly productive, either. The Review does suggest that syntheses of research on carefully delimited topics, relying on research beyond that in social studies education, might be productive. However, we have serious doubts that the research base is there, "waiting for someone to analyze and wring the meaning out of it".

This is not the place for an in-depth exploration of alternative research strategies and approaches. Social studies educators who are interested in such matters, though, should find the three reports to be provocative reading. One can hardly read the Review without being struck by the massive lack of cumulativeness of social studies education research. Reading the Review in the context of the CSSE report also drove home the crucial point mentioned above--the unresponsiveness of most social studies instructional research to the problems and interests of classroom teachers.

We also found ourselves drawn to the contrast between the National Survey--well designed and executed, but sterile in its remoteness from the classroom--and the richness of the CSSE approach. Survey research undoubtedly has its place as a means of gathering information, although it also certainly has been much overdone as a research form, especially for doctoral dissertations. But as a tool for determining the status of science education, in the sense of what is happening to students in science classrooms, the survey data seem to be a pale, remote representation when placed next to the CSSE ethnographic data. Ethnographic research minimizes prestructured expectations and questions. It relies for its data on field observers who are not aloof, detached empiricists, but involved, if analytical, participants in the setting of interest. The CSSE case studies vary in quality. But generally their personal vignettes and on-the-spot interpretations provide a strong feeling of reality that is impossible to capture through questionnaires and observational instruments. And the synthesis chapters in which the findings from the eleven case studies were integrated and discussed contribute to a "holistic" feeling for the teacher's classroom life that is impressive.

In recent years, several authors have commended ehtnographic research

methods to the educational research profession, and to social studies education researchers in particular. The CSSE report is, to our knowledge, the first major attempt to apply ethnography to research in social studies education, and it vidicates those advocates. We hope that there will be more studies from that perspective in the future.

It is important to remember, of course, that the CSSE case studies were carried out and synthesized by trained, experienced field observers. The project personnel were well aware of problems of methodology such as the differing frames of reference and the varying data-gathering styles brought to the sites by the various observer-participants. Moreover, eleven sites were studied--a time-consuming, expensive venture. Clearly university or school district researchers without ethnographic training or experience should be cautious so that efforts to capitalize on the potential of ethnography do not result in an adulterated paradigm and invalid findings. Equally important, it would be an error for doctoral candidates ill-trained in ethnography and without competent supervision to rush out to do limited field studies (limited in theoretical base and/or in number and/or representativeness of sites). The dangers of wasted research effort are no less with the ethnographic approach, and because so much relies on personal perceptiveness and insight, perhaps the dangers are greater.

We would not want anyone to take our affection for the ethnographic approach, as used for CSSE, to mean that we think other types of research should be abandoned. To the contrary, we are arguing for acceptance of the legitimacy of a greater variety of research approaches. Concurrently, more adequate conceptualizations of the research process are needed, taking into account strategies for knowledge-theory development. The development of research design paradigms appropriate to the schooling context and clarifying the choices among approaches depending on the problem and/or the stage of knowledge development is a major task awaiting those interested in promoting the productivity of instructional research in social studies. Of course, the questions are much broader and more difficult than when to use an ethnographic, or some other approach. They go to the heart of the meaning of science and its relevance and adaptibility to the demands of building sound, systematic knowledge about instruction. Such matters deserve a great deal more consideration than can be given them here.

V. Conclusions

It seems wise, although probably unnecessary, to remind the reader once again that we are very much aware of the difficulties and dangers of presenting summaries and presentations based on such quantity and diversity of data as are available in the three NSF-funded reports on the status of science, mathematics, and social studies education. It is not just a matter of the validity of our interpretations, but of our conscious and unintentional selectiveness in deciding what to comment upon. The authors of the CSSE report note that a question was raised about their failure to elaborate on the preponderance of male teachers at the secondary level; but they indicated that point had not surfaced soon enough as a salient problem in their interpretive

frame of reference. Such questions will undoubtedly be raised about this paper, too. For example, we have choosen not to deal with the question of articulation--either vertical, i.e., from course to course, or horizontal, i.e., from school to school. This may seem a strange oversight in light of the frequent concern with scope and sequence on the part of those who write about social studies education. The CSSE report (Ch. 13, 14, 19) does have some things to say about articulation--its frequent absence, the lack of teacher or parental concern about it, the possibility that it may not even be wise if done too specifically by individual districts. This one topic is illustrative of the variety of issues for which relevant data can be found in the reports, depending on the interests of the reader, though we may have choosen to emphasize other matters which took on salience for us in our reading and discussions.

It is also important to recall that the intended audience for this paper is not the National Science Foundation, but social studies educators. And the purpose of the paper was not to critique the National Survey, the Review, and CSSE studies. Rather, it was to summarize the reports and present interpretations of the status and need of social studies education to the extent possible in a brief paper. In developing our impressions of social studies education from reading and discussing the reports, bias, as already noted, has probably been inevitable. In particular, our discussions of status will imply needs. Perhaps the obvious bears restatement, however: Facts do not speak for themselves, and there is nothing in the data themselves that dictates needs or points toward specific desired changes. Such conclusions depend on the value assumptions that one brings to the data. For example, we found the report to portray social studies education as dominated by textbook-recitation type teaching (although a variety of methods are being used). We consciously strived to avoid turning that generalization into a value judgment--especially the common one among professors that, ipso facto, social studies instruction is inadequate and attempts must be made to change it. We have alluded to the possible functionality of the socialization purposes for which teachers use content, and the textbook as the embodiment of subject matter learnings. We have pointed out the demands and the constraints of public universal education--including societal expectations and the reality that teachers face each day working with classes of youngsters who have varying goals and expectations, and many of whom not only lack interest in the specific content of the course but in schooling in general. We have also mentioned that teachers are concerned about the lack of student motivation. We have noted, too, that we lack adequate answers to questions about the effects of textbook-centered instruction in social studies. And that the questions themselves call for more careful consideration of the legitimate socialization functions of the school as the formal education institution for the society.

So, our intent in portraying has not been to imply goodness or badness. Why things are as they are, and to what extent they are functional, are important unanswered questions. This line of inquiry suggests that educational research should undergo a significant shift in orientation. Discussions of the productivity of educational research have commonly been framed in terms of its influence in changing practice. Jackson and Kieslar[7] have expressed well the

---

[7] Phillip Jackson and Sara B. Kieslar. Fundamental research and education. Educational Research, 1977(Sept.), 6(8), 13-18.

need to challenge that traditional perspective, referring to the narrowness in educational research because of

> the almost total absorption with the goal of improving practice and discovering better techniques. We seldom ask whether educators might now be doing as well as can be done in many aspects of their endeavor. We might pay more attention to the possibility that educators may deserve and benefit greatly from some external confirmation of the appropriateness of much of what they are doing.

Of course, the point is not to argue for the uncritical acceptance of current practices, but to suggest that more attention be given to research aimed at discovering and verifying their positive effects. Such research must rest on the careful examination of the assumptions underlying our evaluations of school practices. Moreover, the findings that result may challenge many of those assumptions.

Consideration of current instructional practice leads to some concluding comments on the importance of the teacher as the key to the experiences that students have in social studies. How teachers handle curricular decision-making and shape their classrooms might be affected by greater awareness on their part of their pivotal role not only in determining the curriculum for their students but, in the aggregate, shaping social studies education in the United States. As with any of us, we suspect that teachers are usually so close to, so enmeshed in, their own situations that it is difficult for them to "stand back" to analyze what is happening and set it in broader perspective. Reading the CSSE report in particular could help teachers gain insight into the power of the cumulative decisions they and their colleagues make.

Moreover, the sense of the reality of the classroom for teachers that comes from reading the case studies could be invaluable for district supervisors who wish to understand teachers' concerns in order to work better with them, professors considering appropriate approaches to preservice and inservice teacher education, and curriculum developers who wish their developments to be used in the classroom. In each case, the case studies suggest hypotheses to be tested as a basis for more effective assistance to teachers.

The view of teachers as the key to student learning and the potential of the CSSE study for use in perspective-shaping and hypothesis-formulation also suggest, we believe, that teachers themselves should be more central figures in research in social studies education--but not only as "subjects". More, carefully designed studies of teachers' beliefs, values, and expectations are needed as a basis for understanding what does and can happen in social studies classrooms. But teachers should not be treated exclusively as "subjects" in research studies. They should be partners in the research enterprise. They should be brought into studies as knowledgeable "informants"--in the positive sense of sources of otherwise unobtainable information about the realities that condition the use and effectiveness of teaching methods and materials. Equally important, teachers should be involved to a much greater extent in the process of defining needed research. Such a research partnership need not subvert researchers' interests in theory development--which have not borne much fruit to date; it could help to build linkages so that instructional research in

social studies would have greater payoffs for school practice.

Teachers can tell others, and each other, much more about teaching than we have asked or allowed them to do. Teachers do, in particular, respect other teachers' insights into instructional problems. Professional mechanisms are needed for capitalizing on the validity of teacher knowledge for other teachers. Some of the CSSE case studies led us to think of the brief case reports in medical journals in which medical doctors describe their treatment of difficult or unusual cases. Those reports are somewhat akin to the Classroom Teacher's "Idea" Notebook that is a regular feature in Social Education. But the Notebook is, like most "professional" efforts at assisting teachers, curriculum-oriented; the classroom management and socialization concerns of social studies teachers tend not to get dealt with. On a much broader scale, attempts to assist teachers--whether on the part of the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, or the NCSS Field Services Board--need to tap more explicitly both the concerns and the expertise of teachers.

Perhaps the most fitting way to end this paper is with our overall impression of social studies education in the 1970s. That impression is one of contrasts and contradictions. Amidst many impressions of change (especially if one reads the professional journals, hears the protests of parents in "innovative" districts, attends section meetings at the annual neetings of NCSS--i.e., views the "tip of the iceberg", so to speak), the three NSF-funded status studies indicated that there has been great stability in the social studies curriculum. For instance, there has been considerable publicity in recent years about New Social Studies (especially NSF) curriculum projects. Nevertheless, those who graduated from high school twenty years ago or more would, if they visited their local schools, typically find social studies classes to be similar to those they had experienced. Yet the perception of overall stability should not be allowed to mask significant changes that have occurred in some districts. Nor do we mean to avoid questions of limited perspective. Have there been changes not recognized by those of us close to the scene, in terms of both involvement and point in time? And, how does one judge the perceived stability against societal, and professional, needs for maintenance and continuity, as well as for critical social, and professional, inquiry? Such questions are an intimate part of the contrasts and contradictions in social studies education.

There also is much diversity and variety in what goes on in social studies classrooms, at the same time that there is much sameness. Individual teachers are free to do things differently, and what is expected of students differs somewhat from district to district and from teacher to teacher; but the same textbocks are used in a course "sequence" that varies little from location to location. The result is considerable uniformity across the country--a locally accepted nationwide curriculum--so that students face few problems of continuity in moving from district to district, no more so than in moving from one school to another within a district. Yet, the day-by-day social studies experiences of youngsters often vary dramatically, even in adjacent classrooms.

To sum up, social studies education is not as good as some would claim, but not as bad as others would complain. Despite a lack of interest in, even

an apathy towards, social studies (as well as school in general), most students find school a comfortable place to be. This may be in large part because, despite the disinclination of teachers to reckon with the apparent contradiction between their belief that they know what is good for students, what students need to know and how they learn best, and their prevailing concern for the lack of student motivation, teachers do like their students and are concerned about them personally as well as scholastically. Teachers do want to do a good job; they work hard under a great deal of pressure; apparently, only a few do not give a full measure of effort. So there are in the three NSF project reports reasons for optimism and confidence, mixed with what many will find to be reasons for dismay, even apprehension. Regardless of your stance and your reactions to our impressions, we believe that the reports of the three NSF-funded studies can be of use to you in constructing your own future in social studies education.